



**Statement on the Report of the Working Group on Effective Treaty Implementation
Arms Trade Treaty Informal Preparatory Committee, 20 May 2025**

On behalf of Control Arms - thanks very much to the Ambassador of the Philippines and his team for leading the Working Group on Effective Treaty Implementation (WGETI). We also wish to express our appreciation to the Irish and Sierra Leone teams for their leadership of the Sub-Working Groups in February.

We wish to begin by making some overall observations on the work of the Sub-Working Group on National Implementation Practices. Along with other delegations, Control Arms welcomed the focus this year on the practical implementation of the ATT and the obligation of importing States Parties. A critical point made by Dr. Paul Holtom is that “many States Parties have not yet established national control lists”. In fact, an assessment of all currently available initial reports reveals a more fundamental challenge - approximately half of ATT States Parties could be in a position where they have not yet established and implemented a national control system, which is an obligation under Article 5. This is also despite national control systems being referred to as the “cornerstone of compliance with the ATT”.

It would be useful to discuss the challenges facing States Parties which have not yet implemented national control systems, how such States can be best supported and similar to the recommendations in the reporting of the Working Group on Transparency and Reporting, to include a recommendation encouraging States Parties to implement national control systems and for follow-up work on this matter. We will return to this issue when we speak under the “Review of the ATT process”.

It was notable that the presentations made during the Sub-Working Group did not respond to all of the questions listed. We are unaware of the presentations responding to the question “How do States ensure that their imports are in compliance with Article 6?” It would be helpful to understand how States Parties implement the Article 6 obligations when importing weapons, especially as this Article refers to “transfers” and not only “exports”.

For the reasons outlined in Control Arms’ statement to this Working Group in February, regarding parts and components—which, we note, are not reflected in the report—this issue presents a potential loophole in the Treaty and warrants urgent attention by this forum. We therefore welcome the recommendation to hold a discussion next year on parts and components.

On the arms industry, it is alarming that according to SIPRI last year overall military spending globally reached \$2.7 trillion US dollars. There are significant opportunity costs to this spending. An important point which was underlined by Dr. Hiruni Alwishewa is that the arms industry can draw lessons from other high-risk industries. Sectors such as conflict minerals and surveillance technology provide useful examples of how businesses can implement stronger due diligence frameworks. Moving forward, the arms industry must build on these insights to enhance accountability and minimise the human rights risks associated with their operations.



Control Arms welcomes the thoughtful proposal by Mexico to establish gender focal points under the ATT. We believe that such a role could make an invaluable and sustained contribution towards raising awareness of Article 7(4) and to following up on the recommendations on gender and the ATT at the 5th Conference of States Parties.

Control Arms welcomed the opportunity to make a presentation on the implementation of Articles 7(4). Before heading down the route of incorporating additional guidance into the Voluntary Guidance on Articles 6 and 7, we would first be interested to understand whether States are utilising the information provided in the Voluntary Guide on Articles 6 and 7.

Turning to the ad hoc discussions under the Sub-Working Group on Emerging Issues, we agree with the State of Palestine that the central objective of the ATT is to halt arms transfers when these result in serious violations of international law and human suffering as set out in Articles 6 and 7. With this objective in mind, Control Arms proposed discussion on three contexts currently under investigation by Human Rights Council-mandated mechanisms: the Occupied Palestinian Territories, Myanmar, and Sudan, with particular emphasis on the situations in Myanmar and Sudan. We highlighted these three cases due to the gravity of violations of international law and ongoing human suffering, the continued supply of arms, and the existence of different investigative bodies mandated by multilateral fora. While we acknowledge that these discussions are difficult, they are critical to the credibility of the ATT and this forum and demand a response that goes beyond an exchange of views.